

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Currently, there are six other related appeals which have been filed. These appeals have been filed in the following applications:

Docket No.	App. Ser. No.:	App. filing date:	Appeal filed:
2152-3014	10/676,926	September 30, 2003	January 31, 2008
2152-3023	10/680,591	October 6, 2003	January 31, 2008
2152-3027	10/702,262	November 5, 2003	January 29, 2007* & March 12, 2008
2152-3026	10/703,023	November 5, 2003	July 25, 2006
2152-3030	10/702,415	November 6, 2003	August 8, 2008
2152-3044	11/040,163	January 21, 2005	January 31, 2008

With regard to Ser. No. 10/702,262 (Atty. Doc. No. 2152-3027), the Examiner has recently reopened prosecution by issuing an Office Action on December 10, 2007. On review of this Office Action, it is believed that the Examiner has improperly reopened prosecution as being in violation of the requirements of MPEP § 1207.04 since, *inter alia*, the Examiner failed to obtain the necessary approval from his supervisory patent examiner.¹ Notwithstanding the improper reopening of prosecution in that case, since the Examiner has, in all relevant parts, simply reformulated the same rejections, Appellant has filed a second Notice of Appeal in the '262 application on March 12, 2008.

Appellant notes further that there are approximately five additional pending applications containing substantially the same disclosure as the above-identified applications, and which are assigned to the same Examiner as the present application and the above-mentioned applications. Based upon conversations with the Examiner and his SPE Lincoln Donovan, Appellant anticipates that each of the five pending applications, which if rejected, will also require an appeal to the Board of Appeals and Interferences. Appellant will endeavor to update this section of the present Appeal Brief when necessary to reflect the current status of such related appeals.

¹ The examiner may, with approval from the supervisory patent examiner, reopen prosecution to enter a new ground of rejection after appellant's brief or reply brief has been filed. MPEP 1207.04

CONCLUSION

Appellant respectfully requests that the forgoing Section II be used to replace the Section II of the previously submitted Appeal Brief.

Address all correspondence to:

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY
120 So. LaSalle Street, Ste. 1600
Chicago, IL 60603

Direct telephone inquiries to:

Jeffrey J. Lotspeich
(858) 587-7652
San Diego, California Office of
FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY

Respectfully submitted,

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY

/Jeffrey J. Lotspeich/

Jeffrey J. Lotspeich
Registration No. 45,737
Attorney for Appellant

Date: September 8, 2008